

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
5 AT TACOMA

6 MATTHEW SILVA,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 ROB McKENNA, JOHN S. BLONIEN,
10 DOUGLAS CARR, KIMBERLY
11 FRINELL, AMANDA IGCHELBRING,
12 ELDON VAIL, DAN PACHOLKE,
13 STEVE SINCLAIR, CHRIS
14 BOWMAN, CHUCK PEASE,
15 OFFICIAL JURGENSEN, LINDA
16 MICHAEL, DAVID S. ROBERTS,
17 TAMARA ROWDEN, RONALD
18 FREDERICK, DEVON SCHRUM,
19 LORI SCAMAHORN, DENNIS
20 DAHNE, KERRI McTARSNEY,
21 CORYDON WHALEY, CLINT MAY,
22 CHERYL SULLIVAN, and VANESSA
23 COLEMAN,

24 Defendants.

NO. C11-5629 RBL/KLS

ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S
FILINGS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR "SECOND TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER

19 On April 13, 2012, Plaintiff requested that this Court stay consideration of his Second
20 Motion for "TRO/Preliminary Injunction" (ECF No. 70). ECF No. 79. The Court entered an
21 Order striking the noting date of the motion from the calendar and advised Plaintiff that he
22 could re-note his motion by serving a written notice on the Clerk and opposing counsel. ECF
23 No. 82. Since that time, Plaintiff has filed numerous Declarations and letters. *See* ECF Nos.
24 92-100, and 109. On May 3, 2012, the Court advised Plaintiff that it would take no action on
25 the letters and declarations filed at ECF Nos. 92, 100, and 109. ECF No. 110. Since that
26

1 time, Plaintiff has again filed a Memorandum in Support of Second Motion for TRO and
2 Supplemental Declaration. ECF Nos. 113 and 114. There is no pending motion.

3 A review of Plaintiff's "Second Motion for TRO/Preliminary Injunction" reveals that
4 it merely restates his request for relief under his "pending supplement to objections" under
5 "ECF 10, ECF 12, ECF 18 and ECF 19". See ECF No. 70. These issues were dealt with by
6 the Court in its Order denying Plaintiff's motions for preliminary injunctive relief. ECF No.
7 64. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

9 1) Plaintiff shall refrain from filing additional pleadings "in support of" the
10 "second" motion for temporary relief. There is no such motion pending before the Court. If
11 Plaintiff wishes to file a motion for injunctive relief, he may do so. However, he should keep
12 in mind that any issues raised in any such motion must be related to the issues raised in his
13 complaint and he must establish the following: (1) a likelihood of success on the merits, (2)
14 a likelihood of irreparable injury to the plaintiff if injunctive relief is not granted, (3) a balance
15 of hardships favoring the plaintiff, and (4) advancement of the public interest. *Winter v.*
16 *Natural Res. Def. Council*, 555 U.S. 7, 129 S.Ct. 365, 376, 172 L.Ed.2d 249 (2008) (quoting
17 *Amoco Prod. Co. v. Gambell*, 480 U.S. 531, 542, 107 S.Ct. 1396, 94 L.Ed.2d 542 (1987)).

18
19 (2) The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff and counsel for
20 Defendants.
21

22 **DATED** this 15th day of May, 2012.

23
24 
25 Karen L. Strombom
26 United States Magistrate Judge